



AS

Religious Studies

7061/1-Philosophy of Religion And Ethics
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Methods of Marking

It is essential that, in fairness to students, all examiners use the same methods of marking. The advice given here may seem very obvious, but it is important that all examiners follow it as exactly as possible.

1. If you have any doubts about the mark to award, consult your Team Leader.
2. Refer constantly to the mark scheme throughout marking. It is extremely important that it is strictly adhered to.
3. Remember, you must **always** credit **accurate, relevant and appropriate** answers which are not given in the mark scheme.
4. Do **not** credit material that is irrelevant to the question or to the stated target, however impressive that material might be.
5. If a one-word answer is required and a list is given, take the first answer (unless this has been crossed out).
6. If you are wavering as to whether or not to award a mark, the criterion should be, 'Is the student nearer those who have given a correct answer or those who have little idea?'
7. Read the information on the following page about using Levels of Response mark schemes.
8. Be prepared to award the full range of marks. Do not hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits full marks or to give no marks where there is nothing creditable in an answer.
9. No half marks or bonus marks are to be used under any circumstances.
10. Remember, the key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Do **not** change the standard of your marking once you have started.

Levels of Response Marking

In AS Religious Studies, differentiation is largely achieved by outcome on the basis of students' responses. To facilitate this, levels of response marking has been devised for many questions.

Levels of response marking requires a quite different approach from the examiner than the traditional 'point for point' marking. It is essential that the **whole response is read** and then **allocated to the level** it best fits.

If a student demonstrates knowledge, understanding and/or evaluation at a certain level, he/she must be credited at that level. **Length** of response or **literary ability** should **not be confused with genuine religious studies skills**. For example, a short answer which shows a high level of conceptual ability must be credited at that level. (If there is a band of marks allocated to a level, discrimination should be made with reference to the development of the answer.)

Levels are tied to specific skills. Examiners should **refer to the stated assessment target** objective of a question (see mark scheme) when there is any doubt as to the relevance of a student's response.

Levels of response mark schemes include either **examples** of possible students' responses or **material** which they might use. These are intended as a **guide** only. It is anticipated that students will produce a wide range of responses to each question.

It is a feature of levels of response mark schemes that examiners are prepared to reward fully, responses which are obviously valid and of high ability but do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level. This should only be necessary occasionally and where this occurs examiners must indicate, by a brief written explanation, why their assessment does not conform to the levels of response laid down in the mark scheme. Such scripts should be referred to the Principal Examiner.

Assessment of Quality of Written Communication

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all components and in relation to all assessment objectives. Where students are required to produce extended written material in English, they will be assessed on the quality of written communication. The quality of written communication skills of the student will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark awarded within the level of response. In reading an extended response, the examiner will therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, ie decide whether the answer:

- presents relevant information in a form that suits its purposes;
- is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate, so that meaning is clear;
- is suitably structured and that the style of writing is appropriate.

LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Levels of Response: 15 marks AS-Level – AO1

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Level 5
13-15 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge and understanding is accurate and relevant and is consistently applied to the question.• Very good use of detailed and relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.• The answer is clear and coherent and there is effective use of specialist language and terminology. |
| Level 4
10-12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge and understanding is mostly accurate and relevant and is mostly applied to the question.• Good use of relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.• The answer is mostly clear and coherent and specialist language and terminology is used appropriately. |
| Level 3
7-9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge and understanding is generally accurate and relevant and is generally applied to the question.• Some use of appropriate evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.• The answer is generally clear and coherent with use of specialist language and terminology. |
| Level 2
4-6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge and understanding is limited and there is limited application to the question.• Limited use of appropriate evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.• Limited clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology. |
| Level 1
1-3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge and understanding is basic.• Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information.• Basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary. |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No accurate or relevant material to credit. |

Levels of Response: 15 marks AS-Level – AO2

- Level 5**
13-15
- A very well-focused response to the issue(s) raised.
 - Reasoned and evidenced chains of reasoning supporting different points of view with critical analysis.
 - Evaluation is based on the reasoning presented.
 - The answer is clear and coherent and there is effective use of specialist language and terminology.
- Level 4**
10-12
- A well-focused response to the issue(s) raised.
 - Reasoned and evidenced chains of reasoning, with some critical analysis, supporting different points of view.
 - Evaluation based on some of the reasoning.
 - The answer is largely clear and coherent with specialist language and terminology used appropriately.
- Level 3**
7-9
- A general response to the issue(s) raised.
 - Different points of view supported by evidence and chains of reasoning.
 - The answer is generally clear and coherent with use of specialist language and terminology.
- Level 2**
4-6
- A limited response to the issue(s) raised.
 - A point of view relevant to the issue(s) with limited supporting evidence and chains of reasoning.
 - Limited clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology.
- Level 1**
1-3
- A basic response to the issue(s) raised.
 - A point of view is stated with some evidence or reasons in support.
 - Some clarity and coherence and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary.
- 0**
- No accurate or relevant material to credit.

Question 01

0	1	.	1
---	---	---	---

Explain the cosmological argument for the existence of God.

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: Aquinas' Third Way.

The cosmological argument is based on our observation of certain facts about the universe, for example that all things appear to be caused, which implies the existence of a first cause; also that everything in the universe appears to be contingent, which implies that something must exist necessarily in order to explain the existence of contingent things.

Thomas Aquinas explains this in his Third Way – the argument from Possibility and Necessity: everything can exist or not-exist (everything is contingent); so there must have been a time when nothing had begun to exist. If there was once nothing, then nothing could come from nothing, so something must exist necessarily, otherwise nothing would now exist, which is obviously false.

Aquinas rejects the idea that there could be an infinite series of necessary beings (Aquinas was thinking of angels), and argues that there must be some uncaused being which exists of its own necessity. Aquinas identifies this as the Christian God. The Third Way is part of a cumulative series of arguments (the arguments from motion and change and from causation), and these are meant to be read together.

[15 marks] AO1.1

0 1 . 2

'Process theodicy is not a satisfactory response to the problem of evil.'**Assess this view.****Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: Griffin's Process Theodicy.

Process theodicy (eg that of Griffin) is satisfactory because it is realistic in its account of God. The Process God is not the Creator, since God and the universe exist (and may always have existed) panentheistically (everything is 'in' God and God is 'in' the universe). God is not omnipotent, since ordinary matter can go against his will, so God cannot control evil. For some Christians, however, this is an unsatisfactory account of God, since a God who is neither omnipotent nor omniscient (God cannot know the future, being in time) is not worth worshipping.

Process theodicy holds that evil is a process in matter, and God cannot control it: for example, gravity in the shape of natural disasters kills people, and allows people to use gravity (eg lifting an assassin's hammer) to kill others. God can only seek to persuade humanity to join him in the fight against evil. For most Christians, however, this is not satisfactory, since evil is best explained by the biblical account of the 'Fall' (either literally or metaphorically), and God has a plan for the universe which includes the defeat of evil.

In Process thought, God is the 'fellow sufferer who understands'. God's choices concerning evil were limited either to leaving the universe in a chaotic state or else persuading it into greater order and opening up the possibility of greater evil. For some Christians, however, this is deeply unsatisfactory, since it would show God to be evil, since the risk of radical evil developing in the universe was too great. Moreover, if victory over evil is not guaranteed, then this might lead many to abandon the fight against it.

[15 marks] AO2

Question 02

0	2	.	1
---	---	---	---

Explain what is meant by a numinous experience.

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: Rudolf Otto: numinous experiences as an apprehension of the wholly other.

The main account of numinous experiences is given by Rudolf Otto. 'Numinous' comes from 'numen', Latin for the power of a deity or spirit, so a numinous experience is one that 'relates to the power of a deity or spirit': it is a religious experience of a being who is utterly transcendent – above and beyond the world – and completely holy. The Numinous may be described as the 'Uncanny' – the kind of feeling you would get if you were told that 'there is a mighty spirit in the next room'.

In Otto's account, God is 'wholly other', above and beyond everything and anything else. Numinous feelings are non-rational, meaning that we cannot reason our way to understand them. They are a 'tremendous and fascinating mystery', and are sui generis (unique/of their own kind). The power of the numinous can chill and numb. It produces feelings of stupor, blank wonder, dumb astonishment, humility and creatureliness.

Examples include the call of the prophet Isaiah in the Jerusalem Temple (Isaiah 6), where he hears the angels call out: 'Holy, holy, holy!' Isaiah's response was a feeling of sinfulness. When Jesus' first disciples encountered him, they perceived their own inadequacy in face of his numinous nature. Peter's reaction is to leave everything and follow Jesus.

[15 marks] AO1.1

0 2 . 2

‘Religious experiences cannot be verified.’**Assess this view.****Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: the challenges to the verification of religious experience from science; Richard Swinburne’s principles of credulity and testimony.

Many argue that religious experiences cannot be verified by sense experience, since for the most part they are private experiences that cannot be observed by others. However, this is not a particularly strong objection, because none of our thoughts can be seen by others, so why should religious experiences have to be observable. Moreover Swinburne’s principle of credulity makes a strong point – that where we know that somebody is normally reliable and trustworthy, if that person claims to have had a religious experience, then he or she should be believed.

The argument that religious experiences cannot be verified is supported by neuroscientific claims that they are nothing more than specific states of the brain (including those caused by temporal lobe epilepsy and by devices such as Persinger’s ‘God Helmet’), and so have no external source (God). However this argument proves nothing, since the mere fact that certain brain states are associated with religious experiences does not show that those states are not caused by God.

Verification of religious experiences is made unlikely by the number of arguments against them, eg Freud’s view that they represent wish-fulfilment; the view that they are caused by entheogenic drugs (drugs that make people think they are experiencing God), or that they are invented by people who are desperate to believe. However, none of these arguments are conclusive. To the believer, verification is personal; is supported by religious tradition; and by the ‘fruits’ of religious experience – alterations for the better in the moral character of those who have them.

[15 marks] AO2

Question 03

0	3	.	1
---	---	---	---

Explain how moral decisions may be made using natural moral law.

Target: AO1.4: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including approaches to the study of religion and belief.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: natural moral law and the principle of double effect, with reference to Aquinas; Proportionalism.

Natural moral law is the approach to moral decision-making taken by Aquinas and largely adopted by the Catholic Church. For Aquinas, the natural and moral order exist as blueprints in the mind of God. The principles of natural moral law are revealed by Scripture and by the teachings of the Church, although the detail of the natural moral law is worked out independently of scripture, through reason. Its guiding principle is that 'good is to be done and pursued, and evil is to be avoided'.

Moral decisions are made by following primary precepts, from which secondary precepts are derived in the form of moral rules that must govern human behaviour. These are supported by the cardinal virtues of justice, prudence, temperance and fortitude, and the religious virtues of faith, hope and love; and they are made clear by the principle of 'double effect', which helps people to avoid making mistakes, such as those caused by getting confused about the difference between real and apparent goods.

Some Catholics modify their approach to making moral decisions by taking a proportionalist stance, which sometimes allows a more situational approach to moral dilemmas. Although Proportionalism is rooted in the teachings of Thomas Aquinas (for example where he teaches that it would be lawful for a starving man to save his life by stealing the property of another person).

[15 marks] AO1.4

0	3	.	2
---	---	---	---

‘Natural moral law can give no clear guidance about the issue of cloning.’

Assess this view.

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Cloning is the process of making biological duplicates of an organism. The aim of therapeutic cloning is to cure a range of diseases and conditions such as stroke, heart failure and multiple sclerosis. Natural moral law cannot give clear guidance on such procedures, since its guiding principles are religious, and religion can be seen as irrelevant to medical advances. That would be a common rejection of natural moral law’s approach; nevertheless it is not compelling, because natural moral law is based on reason, and through reason we can make the right decision on cloning.

However, Aquinas’ natural moral law requires us to reject cloning on the grounds that it abandons the usual methods of procreation through loving sexual relationships; also because it would arguably lead to the breakdown of the marriage relationship. How convincing is Aquinas here? There is no suggestion that cloning would replace the marriage relationship as the normal way of producing children. Moreover cloning should be judged by the end result, which is the potential cure for a whole range of diseases which might otherwise remain incurable.

A follower of natural moral law would of course have a ready answer to this last issue: therapeutic cloning does not pass the law of double effect, since it is not permitted to do a bad act in order to achieve a good result. On the other hand, most people would probably think that they would be right to do what would normally be a bad act in order to save many others. Double effect would prohibit killing one person to save a million, yet common sense morality would be to kill the one for the good of the many.

Credit must also be given for reference to animal cloning.

[15 marks] AO2

Question 04

0	4	.	1
---	---	---	---

Explain why people using situation ethics may make different decisions about voluntary euthanasia.

Target: AO1.3: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including causes and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: Fletcher's account of situation ethics.

Situation ethics is by definition a situational approach to ethics, requiring the individual to do that which maximises agape-love in that situation. For that reason there can be no overall decision on voluntary euthanasia or any other moral issue: the situation dictates everything. There are guiding principles that a situationist should follow, such as pragmatism (maximise love), relativism, positivism (affirming the law of love) and personalism (people come before laws), but all of these relate to the situation itself, so different situations merit different responses.

The ethical issues with voluntary euthanasia include the claim that autonomous beings should have a right to die as well as a right to life; and that the effects on human society should be considered where a right to die is considered. Wherever an individual has to decide whether or not to actively support voluntary euthanasia, different people will prioritise these according to the situation and to their own ideas about what would be loving, so decisions will vary from person to person.

All sorts of conditions will lead to different judgements using the same criteria, eg whether the person's choice to die is rational; whether the person is suffering from depression; whether the diagnosis is likely to be 100% correct; or whether the choice has been made with the help of a medical authority. Fletcher himself argues that relief from demoralising pain, where there is no further possibility of serving others, is a sufficient criterion.

Maximum Level 2 for an explanation of the ethical theory only.

[15 marks] AO1.3

0	4	.	2
---	---	---	---

‘Virtue ethics would accept the intensive farming of animals.’

Assess this view.

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: Aristotelian virtue ethics.

The issue of the intensive farming of animals would not have been an issue in the days of Aristotle, so in terms of Aristotelian virtue ethics, it is not clear what the decision would be. If we take the view that the virtues should be directed towards persons, then we might argue that virtue ethics could accept the factory farming of animals. However, the alternative approach is to consider the effects on people of accepting factory farming, where following such procedures might have a bad effect on the people concerned, making them indifferent to the suffering of others in general.

If we look at Aristotle’s views on the hierarchy of souls, which sketches out the vegetative, sensitive and rational types of soul, Aristotle would clearly have no problem with eating meat, since he considered that animals existed in the hierarchy for the sake of humans. Balanced against that, if we consider the conditions under which animals are kept, and the ways in which they are killed in different types of factory farming, it is doubtful that Aristotle would have approved of them.

The main virtue to be considered is perhaps that of compassion. Compassion cannot be compartmentalised so that we talk about compassion just for humans: either you are a compassionate person or you are not. If you are, then compassion should apply to all beings. Factory farming of animals is not remotely compassionate. However, in a modern situation, where people are living in starvation conditions, Aristotle might approve of factory farming, albeit with many safeguards.

[15 marks] AO2